


**PUBLIC COPY**

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass. Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20536




U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services




FILE: WAC 02 067 54647 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: APR 19 2004

IN RE: Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:




PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional Pursuant to  
Section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



**INSTRUCTIONS:**

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

  
Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The employment based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, California Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner seeks to classify the beneficiary as an employment based immigrant pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3), as a skilled worker. The petitioner is a motion picture production company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an administrative assistant. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by an individual labor certification approved by the Department of Labor. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing financial ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage as of the priority date of the visa petition.

On appeal, counsel submits additional evidence and asserts that the petitioner has demonstrated that it has the ability to pay the proffered wage.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(i), provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who are capable, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, of performing skilled labor (requiring at least two years training or experience), not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) provides in pertinent part:

*Ability of prospective employer to pay wage.* Any petition filed by or for an employment-based immigrant which requires an offer of employment must be accompanied by evidence that the prospective United States employer has the ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner must demonstrate this ability at the time the priority date is established and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. Evidence of this ability shall be either in the form of copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements. . . . In appropriate cases, additional evidence, such as profit/loss statements, bank account records, or personnel records, may be submitted by the petitioner or requested by the [CIS].

The sole issue on appeal is whether the petitioner has established its continuing financial ability to pay the beneficiary's offered wage. Eligibility in this case rests upon whether the petitioner's ability to pay the wage offered has been established as of the petition's priority date. The priority date is the date the request for labor certification was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the Department of Labor. Here, the petition's priority date is August 7, 1997. The beneficiary's salary as stated on the labor certification is \$14.60 per hour or \$30,368 annually.

Counsel submitted copies of the petitioner's IRS Form 1120 for the fiscal years 1997 through 2000. The petitioner's fiscal year runs from February 1 to January 31 of the following year. The Forms 1120 showed taxable incomes of -\$4,463; -\$70,335; -\$5,047; and \$77,300, respectively. In addition, the petitioner's net current assets were -\$17,246; \$885; \$6,023; and -\$16,980, respectively.

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, CIS will examine the net income figure reflected on the petitioner's federal income tax return, without consideration of depreciation or other expenses. Reliance on federal income tax returns as a basis for determining a petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage is well established by judicial precedent. *Elatos Restaurant Corp. v. Sava*, 632 F.Supp. 1049, 1054 (S.D.N.Y. 1986)

(citing *Tongatapu Woodcraft Hawaii, Ltd. v. Feldman*, 736 F.2d 1305 (9th Cir. 1984); see also *Chi-Feng Chang v. Thornburgh*, 719 F.Supp. 532 (N.D. Texas 1989); *K.C.P. Food Co., Inc. v. Sava*, 623 F.Supp. 1080 (S.D.N.Y. 1985); *Ubeda v. Palmer*, 539 F.Supp. 647 (N.D. Ill. 1982), *aff'd*, 703 F.2d 571 (7th Cir. 1983).

The director determined that the evidence submitted did not establish that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage and denied the petition accordingly.

On appeal, counsel argues that CIS should take into consideration the tax returns for M. Baxter Productions, Inc. in conjunction with the petitioner's tax returns to establish the ability to pay the wage offered because "these corporations are under common ownership and control and each represents a component of the total income earned each year."

Counsel's argument is not persuasive. The petitioning entity in this case is a corporation. Consequently, any assets of the individual stockholders including ownership of shares in other enterprises or corporations cannot be considered in determining the petitioning corporation's ability to pay the proffered wage. See *Matter of M*, 8 I&N Dec. 24 (BIA 1958; AG 1958); *Matter of Aphrodite Investments Limited*, 17 I&N Dec. 530 (Comm. 1980); and *Matter of Tessel*, 17 I&N Dec. 631 (Act. Assoc. Comm. 1980).

The petitioner's IRS Form 1120 for fiscal year 1997 shows a taxable income of -\$4,463. The petitioner could not pay a proffered wage of \$30,368.00 a year out of this income.

In addition, the petitioner's taxable income figures for 1998 and 1999 continue to show an inability to pay the wage offered. Even though the petitioner had the ability to pay the wage in 2000, the petitioner must show that it had the ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date of the petition and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent resident status. See 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2).

Accordingly, after a review of the record, it is concluded that the petitioner has not established that it had sufficient available funds to pay the salary offered as of the priority date of the petition and continuing.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.